

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 10-20705

ALI DARWICH,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO RELEASE INFORMATION AND  
MOTION TO RELEASE TRANSCRIPT**

Before the court are three documents filed by Defendant Ali Darwich which relate to the same subject matter: a motion to release information (Dkt. # 134), a motion to release transcripts (Dkt. # 169), and an April 1, 2011, letter (Dkt. # 135). The three documents include more rhetoric about Defendant's wholly frivolous theory that the Government, this court, and others are "lying" and "muniplat[ing]" the record in order to "protect" or "cover the mafia," (Dkt. # 169 at 2), and are also engaged in some sort of conspiracy to facilitate the killing of Defendant by "the mafia," (Dkt. # 134 at 1). The documents are primarily a vehicle for Defendant to further ramble about his unsubstantiated theories, and contain no articulated legal basis for any discernable relief. In the motion to release information, he states that he wants to give information to the CIA. (Dkt. # 134 at 2.) A similar request has already been denied by this court and there is no reason to revisit it now. (See Dkt. # 140.) In the motion to release transcripts, Defendant states generally that he wants the clerk to transfer all transcripts to the Court of Appeals. (Dkt. # 169.) Defendant has not submitted the required

documentation for requesting the preparation of a transcript of any proceedings, nor has he indicated what proceedings he may want transcribed.<sup>1</sup> More fundamentally, the court would not authorize the preparation of transcripts at public expense, at this stage in the litigation, in order to “send to the Court of Appeals.” While Defendant continues to file appeals after unfavorable rulings by this court, it is unlikely the Court of Appeals will hear any such appeals until the conclusion of the litigation. The Court of Appeals has already indicated, in its April 8, 2011, order, that it lacks jurisdiction of pretrial rulings of this court. (Dkt. # 150, dismissing appeal for lack of jurisdiction).

Inasmuch as Defendant has failed to show entitlement to any form of relief in these documents,

IT IS ORDERED that the Defendant’s motion to release information [Dkt. # 134], and motion to release transcripts [Dkt. # 169] are DENIED.<sup>2</sup>

S/Robert H. Cleland  
ROBERT H. CLELAND  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 17, 2011

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, May 17, 2011, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner  
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk  
(313) 234-5522

---

<sup>1</sup>If such transcripts are necessary for *trial*, Defendant is instructed to consult with his standby counsel for assistance in submitting the required forms for transcript preparation.

<sup>2</sup>Because the April 1, 2011 document (Dkt. # 135) was self-labeled a letter, rather than a motion, the court need not formally deny it. The court notes, however, that any issues raised in the letter are rendered moot by this order.